Ostrolenk Faber LLP

Intellectual Property Law

1180 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036 212.382-0700 Fax 212.382.0888 $\mathbf{www}.ostrolenk.com$ email@ostrolenk.com

Partners Samuel H. Weiner Robert C. Faber Max Moskowitz James A. Finder William O. Gray III David J. Torrente Louis C. Dujmich Charles P. LaPolla Douglas A. Miro

Kourosh Salchi**

Associates Joel J. Felber** Michael I. Markowitz Keith J. Barkaus Jeff Kirshner Anna Vishev Sean P. McMahon A. Gregory Gibbs

Of Counsel Martin Pfeffer Martin J. Beran Paul Grandinetri* Mark A. Farley George Brieger Stephen J. Quigley Art C. Cody

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

DATE:	Septer	nber 3, 2009		-		
			number of pages, including cover: 3			
TO:						
NAME/COMPANY			FACSIMILE NO.			
Examiner Lucas A. Stelling U.S. Patent and Trademark Office			(571) 270-4725	□ SUCCESSFULLY FAXED		
				☐ SUCCESSFULLY FAXED		
		<u> </u>		☐ SUCCESSFULLY FAXED		
FROM:		Mark A. Farley				
OUR FILE	NQ.:	P/567-130	RETURN TO: _S	Sherrice		
IF YOU DI	D NOT R	ECEIVE ALL THE PA	AGES, PLEASE PHONE (212) 382-	-0700 AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.		
confidential o	or exempt fro onsible for o	om disclosure under applic delivering the message to a	ividual(s) to which it is addressed, and ma able law. If the reader of this message is no an intended recipient, you are hereby noticed. If you have received this communication	ot an intended recipient, or the employee fied that any dissemination, distribution		

MESSAGE:

USPTO Examiner Lucas A. Stelling Group Art Unit: 1797 U.S. Serial No.: 10/565,992

by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address by mail. Thank you.

Our Ref: P/567-130

PTOL-413A (05-03)
Approved for use through xx/xx/xxxx. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM										
Application No.: 10/565,992		First Named Applicant:	Dennis Wowern Nielsen							
Examiner: Lucas A., Stelling	3		Status of Non-Final Office Application: Action							
Tentative Participants:										
(1) Examiner Lucas A., Stelling (2) Mark A. Farley, Reg. No. 33,170										
(3)										
Proposed Date of Interview: September 11, 2009 Proposed Time: 2:00 PM (AM/PM)										
Type of Interview Requested: (1) [XX] Telephonic (2) [] Personal (3) [] Video Conference										
Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: [] YES [X] NO If yes, provide brief description:										
Issues To Be Discussed										
Issues (Rej., Obj., etc.)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed					
(1) § 103 Rejections - based primarily on combination of Welwyn reference and Van Slyke reference	<u>All claims</u>	UK 1,567,773 of Welwyn Hall Research Association; and	[]	[]	[]					
(2)		USP 6,916,426 to Van Slyke, et al.	[]	[]	[[]					
(3)			[].	[]	[]					
[] Continuation Sheet Attac	ched	•	,		•					
Brief Description of Argum	ents to be Pr	esented:								
Diegee eee attach	ad shaot									
Please see attached sheet										
An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on										
NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP §713.01). This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR										
Mark A. Farley Registration No.: 33,170 Examiner/SPE Signature										
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature										

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual cases. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

P/567-130 U.S. Serial No. 10/565,992

PROPOSED TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

The Van Slyke reference "teaches away" from combining its disclosure with that of Welwyn. That is, on the one hand Welwyn teaches to sanitize the waste by the addition of quicklime wherein the pH is raised to 9 and preferably to 11. The reference additionally teaches that the reason for use of quicklime is the treated material is to be used as a fertilizer and, thus, the addition of the CaO would be valuable in that regard.

On the other hand, in contrast, Van Slyke teaches that the waste is treated to render it acidic with one, and optionally two, acidic waste treatments. Moreover, the purpose of the acidic treatment is not to sanitize the waste. In order to sterilize the waste a UV treatment is taught. Furthermore, the acid treatment is not even required (i.e. for sterilization) as the reference teaches to flocculate the waste immediately and that the acid treatment is (only) necessary if such flocculation treatment is not possible.

Van Slyke, thus, teaches away from combining its disclosure with that of Welwyn since the latter teaches to render the waste highly basic whereas Van Slyke teaches to render the waste acidic. Further, the treatment with base in Welwyn is for the purpose of sanitization whereas, in Van Slyke, the waste is sanitized via a UV treatment. Finally, the treated waste in Welwyn is to be used for fertilizer whereas the teaching in Van Slyke to render the waste acidic means that it is not useful for the use envisioned by Welwyn.